

many of the propositions I had asserted for
1961 ^{and 1964} were equally true of other critical
decision periods, going back to the early '40's;
see Bell's ~~work~~ ^{paper} ~~in his~~ ^{earliest} ~~pathbreaking paper~~ and
subsequent research ~~that~~ confirmed his finding. ~~Bell's~~
~~important paper~~ Readers should consult Bell's
important paper ~~with~~ ^{written} ~~draft~~ ^{draft} (in ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~context~~ ^{context}
of this one) for this same panel, "Victims: Some
Hypotheses About Why and How," for much
more evidence bearing on these propositions and
for ^{some} alternative hypotheses ~~on~~ ^{on} the motives
generating the decision patterns that, we
agree, are-to-be-explained. (The differences
between Bell's explanations of events — his Hypotheses
1 and 2 — and ~~that~~ ^{that} ~~presented~~ ^{presented} ~~below~~ ^{in later sections}
~~below~~, are sharp and significant: and ^{perhaps} ~~potentially~~
greater than they should be, for ~~either~~ ^{either} ~~discussion~~ ^{discussion}.
Later drafts of the paper will address ~~these~~ ^{competing} ~~conflicting~~ ^{conflicting}
~~interpretations~~, but ~~which~~ ^{will address} ~~will still be produced~~ ^{will still be produced}.
(They are not discussed here (except for footnotes 23 and 42 below).
~~attending to~~ ^{attending to} Later drafts of this paper will address
Bell's competing interpretation, which certainly deserves

consideration, ~~and continuing interchange may well~~
~~reduce our differences to matters of degree~~
and further reflection and interchange may well
reduce our differences in this more speculative
area.

[^{notes} ~~David~~ Kell, Note 1, 1961; get SA Section (Kellin); other notes
Call: Macarthur, 850, Jester [Stannis---] Thomson, (Hollington) ^{notes}

- Why not call DE immediately? W

- Imagine CG had received my paper before drafting his?

~~What~~ What should he have done?

(What would I think, if I had then seen his?) ^{given "phases"}
^{"misapprehension"}

- Imagine CG --- had received paper before reading his.

What problems remain?

- Why I didn't admit more "gravely". (Correct). Why I came to see him?
Why am am, for all, implying. Why I didn't discuss with more.

- C.F.R. meetings: Thomson

(Check with Thomson, ---

Copplebell ---

- Hyp: ~~DE~~ DE had perception of paradox first. 1961, (1964-65)

CG saw rule first.

(Ours decision)

- Note: 2d communication incompatible with first:

"DE heard, agreed, but undisputed on "years ago".

But fact, all G's explicit of 2d day compatible with
my view of things.

[We are "compatible"

Revised

- Issues: Use of studies

474-0397

Ref. to studies

McNair

Sharing topics

Cross-references

[My refs to CG paper:]

Classified stuff

- expected to ask him, acknowledge
- did not find debate (response to studies)
- tried to manage ref, specific to disagree
(downplay common sense,
"let papers confirm each other, low key")

- "Stipulate" nature of data, contents

Future: - Conjectures: hist, pros & cons, analysis, disagreements

1961: Kennedy Paradox

DPP - lecture on SA (Archibald, Wolf, OEO...

To Moorsteen, on his return: he agrees! (On political fear)

~~Wilderness?~~

to Ruman: in car, on way to look at ship (before his accident!) NSR: "If you can
to Tantr, start of summer (critique of quicksand....) prove that...."

Tony Russo?

(Sham? apply?)

SA lecture notes

Sham Notes: S-r forces

Note #1 ✓

(note #3: criticism)

1961 Study ✓

Woodwin interview ✓

(Mogus?)

Notes: DPP, US air/attention, P.S.

SEADAG meeting! ✓

Home? (He argues with me!)

When did ~~we~~ ^I get Ball

abstract? Was it

before RAND conf?

Hallston

Starrs (interviews?)

DE anti-quicksand

Samus: Studies: '61 Paradox; DPP; estimates; Phase A-B

Politics: 1946-54 Study

S-r, L-r

[There are there for my

reader of studies; should

we do joint piece?]

(I told her he should use them,
or publish; he said he would
not).

[I saw studies - other

than '61 - to her. What
were they made available for?
But couldn't use at RAND].

without trouble for RAND] by
1961 study, my 1964 effort,
Studies.)

(Not in studies, or
in Hall)

Hansen, Greenland

Moorsteen (confirms)

Holstein: don't ... not work with

1964-65 experience (building, troop buildup, no-mob....)

Quicksand vs. Escalation: Pat's table

Have not heard ^{this} from her; What does he think I thought? (Compare to DPP,
1961 study, my 1964 effort,
Studies.)